

4.—SRI ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigation).—

- (a) Yes. Fourth works.
(b) They are not remunerative.

Member's Representation

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ. (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ವಿದ್ಯಾ ಸಚಿವರು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಪೆಷಲ್ ಮೆಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಡಾ. ಲಕ್ಷ್ಮಣಸ್ವಾಮಿ ಮೊದಲಯಾರವರು ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಲು ವಿಶ್ವವಿದ್ಯಾನಿಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಮಾಲಯಪ್ಪರ ನೇಮಕದಿಂದ ಬೇಜಾರಾಗಿ ರಾಜನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಒಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಆತ್ಯಾಶ್ಚರ್ಯಕರವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He must first intimate the Chair about the matter he wish as to raise. I cannot allow it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ.—ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ವಿಷಯ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್‌ರವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸುಳ್ಳು ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನನಗೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He must give notice in writing before he makes any allegations of that type; then only I may think whether to allow it or not. He knows the procedure.

SRI G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—Sir, can such a thing not be raised after question hour and answers got? Do you expect every thing to be written and sent to the Speaker? If that is the case, we have got to employ a stenographer.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon. Member knows the procedure.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ.—ಪ್ರಶ್ನೋತ್ತರದ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್‌ರವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುವಾಗ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೋ ಅದನ್ನು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೇವರಾಜ ಅರಸ್‌ರವರು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿನ್ಯೆ ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಸುಳ್ಳು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am sorry, I am not allowing it. What he Minister said was that he we was not aware of that statement. We are not here to discuss the paper report. A specific question was asked whether he was aware of such a publication and he said that he was not aware of it. Whether what he said is correct or not, does not arise. He must first substantiate it and then bring before the Chair. So, it cannot be allowed.

SRI C. J. MUCKANNAPPA (Sira).—What about the statement made by the Education Minister in the Upper House about Dr. Lakshman-swamy Mudaliar, Sir? It is a very important thing. We cannot raise it except with your goodwill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He has got ample opportunities to raise that point and speak.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ (ತೃಂಗೇರಿ). ಬಡ್ವೆಟ್ಟಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ಗೈರು ಹಾಜರಿಯ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನನ್ನ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಪಾದನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಬಡ್ವೆಟ್ಟಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾದುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಬಿ. ಜಿ. ಲಂಗೇಗೌಡರವರು ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಒಂದು ಅಪಾದನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ನಿನ್ನೆ ದಿವಸ ನಾನು ಇಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇ ಇದ್ದಾಗ

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಲಂಗೇ ಗೌಡರವರು ಭಾಷಣ ಮುಗಿಯುವುದರೊಳಗಾಗಿ ಪುನಃ ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಾಗ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿಯಿತು. ಅವರ ಭಾಷಣದ ಪೂರ್ಣವಿವರಗಳು ನನಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಎರಡು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳಿದರೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ನಿಜವಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒದಿದ ನಂತರ ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲಿನ ಅಪಾದನೆಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ತಪ್ಪುಂಟಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member came yesterday later on and refuted the statement. He made a short statement also. He need not rely on the paper report. He can get a copy of the proceedings if he wants. If he wants any information, I will supply and let us see what happens. He may please go through the matter and then let us see.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಇವೊತ್ತು ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಬಾಕಿ ದಿವಸಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ತಾವು ಆಗ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ರೆಲವೆಂಟ್ ಅಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುತ್ತೀರಿ.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—No, no. If he wants to refute any statement, he must have first hand information. Otherwise, he may say one thing and the other Member may say that he did not say so.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣ ರಾವ್ (ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಿಟಿ).—ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೊರಗಿರುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವರನ್ನು ಡಿಫೆಂಡು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಾವು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಷಣದ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಹಾಗೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದ ಭಾಷಣದ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳನ್ನು ತರಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಈಗ ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಇದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣವೇ ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It is a personal matter and if the Hon'ble Member wants any information, he can approach me. Before he intends to rely upon any press report, he can come to me and get himself satisfied.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಎಸ್. ಸೂರ್ಯನಾರಾಯಣರಾವ್.—ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ರೆಪ್ರೆಸೆಂಟೇಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮಗೆ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಸಿಗದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ಮೆಟೀರಿಯಲ್ ಸಿಗುವುದು ಪೇಪರ್‌ಗಳ ಮೆಟೀರಿಯಲ್‌ಗಳೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He is confusing things. Sri Kadidal Manjappa says that some thing personal against him was said on the floor of this House and that he had read it in the papers. Relying upon that, he wants to make a statement here. These are personal matters; let him have first hand information and then we shall see.

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, supposing I am away and something is said about me and my friends convey to me that some allegation is made against me. Have I not the right to contradict it here ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Not upon rumours; They must have first hand information.

SRI G. DUGGAPPA (Holalkere).—The official report may kindly be made available to the Hon'ble Member concerned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That I have said. He is only repeating what I have already said.

†Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, that cannot be done. When such an incident took place when the present Finance Minister was the Chief Minister and when he made a statement against me, I applied for a copy of that statement and the office said that a speech of one member cannot be given to another member unless it is a printed copy. A doubt has arisen in the minds of the Members, after your making a statement, that a copy of the proceedings will be supplied. If it is a ruling that the copies of the statements of Ministers or Members will be supplied, we will take it for granted that we have an opportunity to take copies and make personal explanations. Shall we take it for granted that the Deputy Speaker has given such a Ruling? Let it be very specific, because in a previous instance, the Hon'ble Speaker has written a letter to me that no copy of the proceedings of one Member will be supplied to other Members. I request the Deputy Speaker to give a Ruling on this to enable the Members to exercise their privilege.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Sir, the Budget discussion is not closed; it is continuing. We are in the midst of the discussion. Hon'ble Member Sri Kadidal Manjappa wants to offer his personal explanation. He is perfectly right, because the Budget discussion is a continuous process. It is neither a fresh subject nor a representation. It is only in the course of the discussion that he wants to offer his personal explanation. He is perfectly in his limits and so he is entitled to offer his personal explanation. No copy of the speech is necessary because he has heard what the Hon'ble Member Sri Linga Gowda has said. It is but right that the Member should be given an opportunity to explain.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member, Sri Kadidal Manjappa says that something personal was said against him. Yesterday, he took an opportunity to speak.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—It was only an introduction. I was not allowed to make a statement yesterday. I want to explain now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Before I can allow him to make a statement, let me satisfy myself whether I can allow him when he had already an opportunity yesterday.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have not made a statement, I was not given an opportunity to make a statement. I only stood up and said that the allegations made are baseless and false.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may please see me and let him discuss with me and then I shall consider whether I can allow him for the second time to make a statement. Let him first discuss the matter with me. I do not allow any discussion on this.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—I would like to bring to your notice that it is an accepted parliamentary practice that no allegations should be made against the person who is not in the House to defend himself. If you analyse that principle, it goes to say that a serious allegation has been made against the Member who is sitting here. Should not that Member be given a chance to explain his conduct to the House? For that you have to take shelter and recourse to the procedure. Both the Members were present in the House. Should not that Members get pro-

tection under the hands of the Chair? All of us, by matter of right, have a right to explain to refute the allegations.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—After having heard the views of all the Members, the Chair has assured the House that he is going to look into the matter, go through the proceedings and give a ruling or decision to us. Should we not wait till then? Ample opportunity will be given to the Hon'ble Member to make a statement.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—It is a matter of right that we must be allowed to offer our suggestions.

Sri S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—I entirely agree with the Hon'ble the Minister for Finance that ample opportunity will be given to Sri Kadidal Manjappa to make a statement, but that time should be before the Finance Minister's reply, because the discussion will close after the reply. So the best opportunity to be given to Sri Kadidal Manjappa would be before the Finance Minister's speech. He may not take more than a few minutes to explain. I request the Speaker to give him an opportunity to make a statement.

Sri B. J. LINGE GOWDA (Channapatna).—If he is given an opportunity to explain, I must also be given an opportunity to reply.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I entirely agree with the Hon'ble the Leader of the Opposition that Sri Kadidal Manjappa should be given an opportunity to make a statement before my speech is finally concluded. This is a Budget session; to-day is not the final reply. Again, on the 23rd of this month, when we are discussing my Demand, I will have to reply. Before that, I am sure, the Chair will consider the matter.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, we are deviating from the procedure.

DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Which is that procedure?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The conventions followed on the floor of this House. I would like to bring one intension to your notice. When the then Opposition Leader, Sri B. K. Puttaramaiah made a personal allegation against the then Education Minister, Sri Venkatappa, the Minister was allowed to offer his explanation after three days. So, my friend, Sri Kadidal Manjappa, who has come forward to offer his explanation, can make a statement at a later date. These things happened here and the Ruling is there for everything. We do not know the exact date; we cannot go and search the case and produce it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—He is saying the same thing. I have said that I am not going to allow an opportunity. The Member had already an opportunity and he is not satisfied. He said that he did not get the information regarding all that was said against him. So, he is going to make a statement. I am requesting the Hon'ble Member to have full information and also discuss with the Chair and then make that statement.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Rule 293 says that a Member with the permission of the Speaker make a personal explanation although there is no question before the Assembly. In such a case, no debate on the matter shall be brought forward and no date shall arise. This is a blanket

(SRI S. M. KRISHNA)

ru e. The point is, Sri B. J. Linga Gowda made an allegation in the course of his budget speech. Naturally the rules of procedure provide for an opportunity for the Member concerned to make a personal explanation. Why all this fuss about it

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have not denied any opportunity to the Member. All that I said was; at the Member might have full information about it and then make the statement here. Yesterday he made a statement and to-day he again wants to make a statement.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Yesterday I did not make a statement. I only said that the allegation had been made and I wanted an opportunity to make a personal explanation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I want time to study this question by going through the proceedings of yesterday. I want to know what was the allegation made and the refutation made by the other Hon'ble Member. Let me convince myself and then I will consider whether it can be allowed.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—There is no question of the Speaker getting convinced about it.

†Sri K. S. SURYANARAYANA RAO.—May I read Rule 293? It says that even when there is no subject before this House, no question before the House, even spontaneously and on the spur of the moment, if there is anything that calls for a personal explanation, then that must be permitted. That is the interpretation. Otherwise, we would be denying privileges of this House and the Members would be reduced to the position of petitioners before the Speaker. We must have our rights to explain our conduct. That is the procedure that is contemplated in it. It is not as if that we present a petition to the Speaker and wait at his chamber to explain our position and then he will give his due consideration. If the Chair is satisfied that an allegation was made and if an opportunity is called for, the Member must have that opportunity. Otherwise, there is no sanctity for any discussion or debate. It only becomes something like Tenali Ramakrishna writing down a picture. It should not happen like that.

Sri B. RACHIAH (Minister for Forest and Fisheries).—Sir, you were pleased to say that you will go through the proceedings of yesterday and study the matter and that you will give an opportunity to make a statement. To use that rule 293, the pre-requisite is the Chair must be satisfied.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS.—The Hon'ble Speaker is satisfied about it.

Sri B. RACHIAH.—The pre-requisite is, 'with the permission of the Chair' an opportunity should be given to make a statement whether a subject is before the House or not. You have not allowed him to make a statement. You want to be convinced whether there is a *prima facie* case. There the matter ends.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I have a right to explain and nobody can take away that right. It is not a question of convincing the Speaker whether I have a right. When an allegation is made against a Member of this House, I should be given an opportunity to explain to show to the House and to the public that the allegations are false and *mala fide* and there is no truth in it.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That right has certain limitations. The rule says: 'A member may, with the permission of the Speaker, make a personal explanation'.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I am asking for your permission.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Before I permit, I wish to go through what transpired yesterday to consider the matter and I want some time. That is all. The matter ends there. If he persists that he has a right to make a statement at once, that is not a fair argument. I do not allow anybody to speak on this subject now. The matter should stop there.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—I am raising a point of order Sir. The point of order is this: Is the Chair in order in permitting the Finance Minister to reply to the Budget when an Hon'ble Member of this House wants an opportunity to explain himself against a specific allegation made on the floor of this House, when he is requesting the Chair to provide him with an opportunity to make a statement explaining his position regarding the allegation. The Chair is convinced and the Hon'ble Members on both sides of the House are convinced, that an opportunity should be given to the Hon'ble Member.

10 A.M.

†**Sri S. SIVAPPA.**—How he should be given and when he should be given an opportunity is the only question for consideration. You have also said that you are prepared to give him an opportunity provided you are convinced that he should be given an opportunity. Now the Hon'ble Member wants to explain the position, and it is also a right on the part of any member to make his personal explanation when certain allegations are made against him by another member. That right is conceded, but when he should be given such an opportunity is the only question for consideration. After all, we are trying to set up healthy precedents in this House. One healthy precedent should be to provide him an opportunity before the Finance Minister begins his speech. After the Finance Minister's speech is over, when everything is over, if you want to give the Hon'ble Member an opportunity, what is the use. I would request the Chair to give an opportunity at the right time, that is, now alone. After all, he may take two or three minutes. Let us create a very healthy precedent in this House. Please do not call upon the Finance Minister to make his speech now. I request him not to be in a hurry.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Let him understand what I am saying. I was not present yesterday and hence I do not know whatever transpired between these two members. I wish to go through the whole matter.

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

The Leader of the Opposition says that I am fully convinced. That is not correct. I want to convince myself; I want to go through the matter. I am only saying that I should have some time so that I may consider the matter. If the Hon'ble Members insist that I should take no time and that I should allow the Hon'ble Member to offer his explanation, that is not proper. Hon'ble Members are all experienced legislators.

Sri K. LAKKAPPA (Hebbur).—In supporting the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition, I would like to draw the attention of the Chair to rule 293, according to which an Hon'ble Member has every right to make a personal explanation, of course with the permission of the Chair, but the Chair should judiciously exercise the discretion...

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Chair should permit...

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—Of course, discretion vests in the Chair, but the matter becomes stale if any time is taken in coming to a decision on this matter. The idea is to safeguard the interests of the member against whom an allegation is made and it is the right that should be exercised and the Chair will consider this aspect and give permission to the Hon'ble Member to make his explanation. It is a serious matter that has transpired; allegation is made against an Hon'ble Member who is ex-Minister. I would appeal to the Chair to give him an opportunity here and now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already said that I want some time to go through the matter and after going through the whole matter, I will consider giving an opportunity to the Hon'ble Member to make whatever explanation he wants to. I have said that I was not present in the House; I have not heard anything. It is my permission that is required and so I wish to go through the whole matter.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH (Mudigare).—I am not creating any fuss. I want to bring to the notice of the Chair what has happened yesterday. The Hon'ble Member Sri Linge Gowda said clearly and categorically that the Hon'ble Member Sri Kadidal Manjappa with the intention.....

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Let him not repeat whatever the member has said. I will go through the record.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—Have I no right to say what I have heard in this House?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am not allowing the Hon'ble Member to repeat the matter.

Sri ANGADI CHANNABASAPPA (Hadagalli).—You say that you were not present in person in the House, but you do not want to hear the members who actually heard it.

Sri K. H. RANGANATH.—I am least interested in creating any fuss in this House. I am the first to uphold the prestige of the House. I would like to say what has happened yesterday.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I am going to look into the proceedings and there ends the matter.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—What Sri. Linge Gowda said was, Sri Kadidal Manjappa went to the extent of...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I will not allow it. If Members go on repeating whatever things alleged to be wrong are stated by another member, would it be proper? That should not happen in this House. Sri Ranganath also is a experienced legislator and he knows if a member said certain wrong things which ought not to have been said on the floor of the House and if another member were to repeat the same, saying that he has got a right...

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Have I no right to defend the honour of a particular member of this House?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Member is trying to create complications. I am not allowing anybody to repeat what that member said. I have said that it would not be proper to repeat whatever wrong things are stated by one member, another member repeating and again committing the same thing. That would not be fair also. Whatever wrong things or bad things or unparliamentary things were said...

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—It is a damaging statement which he has made; it is not a question of deciding whether it is parliamentary or unparliamentary.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Even if it be damaging, if other members go on repeating the same thing, that will not be in keeping with the dignity of the House.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—Supposing a Member of this House was to stop to that level...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Would it be proper to repeat what another Member said now?

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—It is not merely a matter between the two Members of the House, it is also a matter affecting the dignity of the House.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Chair is there to protect the rights of Members and the dignity of the House. What all I am asking in this case is that some time may be given to me so that I can study at first-hand what the Members said.

SRI K. H. RANGANATH.—What will be the feelings of the public if the Member is not allowed to make a statement of personal explanation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The matter should be deemed to be over now. Let us proceed to the next item.

SRI G. V. GOWDA.—I want just one minute to explain what the significance of the word "permission of the Chair" is.

(SRI G. Duggappa rose)

SRI K. LAKKAPPA.—I wish to raise a point of order. When the Speaker is on his legs, how can another Member rise and speak?

(Several Members rose)

Sri SANJIVANATH AIKALA (Suratkal).—The Chair wants some time. The Hon'ble Member, Sri Kadidal Manjappa is also serious that he should refute the allegations made against him. Therefore, I suggest that the house be adjourned for 15 minutes. Meanwhile the Hon'ble Member may meet the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—How can it happen ?

Sri SIVAPPA.—The Chair wants sometime to find out if there was a substantial case for allowing a personal explanation. I know that the Chair is fully convinced. Sri Sanjivanath Aikala has suggested the adjournment of the House so that the Member and the Chair might have an opportunity to study the matter. We also used to rise for tea-break at this hour. We can reduce it to 15 minutes and adjourn the house.

Sri SANJIVANATH AIKALA.—The same procedure prevails in Parliament also.

Sri G. V. GOWDA.—Sir, the Speaker is expected to regulate the proceedings of the House and to conduct the business. While doing so, a Member naturally seeks the permission of the Chair if he wants to make a statement of personal explanation. In the normal course, the Speaker ought to give the permission asked of it. It is not as if, the Speaker has to take time, consider the entire matter whether to allow the Member or not. When a Member is hurt by the remarks of another Member, naturally he intervenes and seeks the permission of the Chair, which has to regulate the proceedings. That permission is formal.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I understand that. Some things happened yesterday. I have to go through the proceedings. The Hon'ble Member affected has given some explanation already and I have to see it. Now there should be an end of this matter. If Members go on persisting that they should make a statement once, twice or thrice, it would not be proper. I wish to see if any opportunity had already been given to Sri Kadidal Manjappa. I will give him some time, if I come to the conclusion that he should have an opportunity. Other proceedings may meanwhile continue and nothing comes in its way.

Sri ANGADI CHENNABASSAPPA.—The nature of the question before the Speaker does not admit an enquiry before giving his permission.

Sri M. C. BASAPPA (Chamarajnagar).—Can anybody dictate to the Speaker ?

(Several Members rose)

Sri ANGADI CHANNABASAPPA.—The Chair knows the atmosphere and the view of the House on this matter. I therefore request him to permit the Hon'ble Member to make the statement he wants.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—It need not be at once.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—With the assurance of the Chair, we are satisfied that the Congress Ministry is corrupt. It is proved and it is established. Unless permission is given for Mr. Kadidal Manjappa to make a statement, we will take it that he was a corrupt Minister when he was Chief Minister and when he was in the Jatti Ministry. In the

absence of an explanation, it is established that he stooped to corrupt practices when he was in office.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I do not allow the discussion on the matter.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—That is how I understand. In the absence of a personal explanation, we have to take it that what my friend Mr. Linga Gowda said is established.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Order, Order. I am not going to allow an indirect discussion on the merits of the case. Now, the matter should rest here. I have explained the whole matter. I request the Hon'ble Finance Minister to begin his reply.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Mr. Speaker, Sir,

† **Sri S. SIVAPPA.**—Sir, I have raised a point of order and it is still there and no ruling is given. The point of order is that the Finance Minister should not be allowed to reply to the debate till an opportunity is given to Sri Kadidal Manjappa to offer his personal explanation. When the Speaker is convinced that an opportunity should be given to an Hon'ble Member when personal allegations have been made against him during the debate, that opportunity must be given to him before the budget discussion concludes. If that is not done, how can the budget discussion conclude? So, opportunity must first be given for a personal explanation to Sri Kadidal Manjappa before the Finance Minister replies; otherwise, it will have no value. Let this House have the satisfaction that the rights of the Members are safeguarded. I do not know why the Finance Minister is so very hasty to make his reply. After all, we are here to establish very healthy conventions. This has been an occasion during the course of two years to discuss a very vital point, i.e., offering a personal explanation where some personal allegations have been made. Unfortunately, the allegation is from a Member of the same party. In fact the Finance Minister should have been more eager than to give such an opportunity because Sri Kadidal Manjappa, his ex-colleague, has been condemned. This will have wider repercussion in the country. I am requesting the Speaker not to allow such a thing to happen. After all, we are working in a democracy. Let an opportunity be given to the Member to give his personal explanation. I am not bothered about Sri Kadidal Manjappa. But a serious allegation is made against an ex-Minister. Can it go without a challenge in this House, without offering some personal explanation? I am not forcing you but I am requesting you to please make up your mind to give an opportunity before the Finance Minister commences his reply. Otherwise, this will have no value.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member Sri Sivappa should know that one day has already elapsed and he says that at once a chance should be given for personal explanation. Nothing is going to happen if the matter is delayed for some more time. I wish to know whether the Member has already availed himself of an opportunity to offer his personal explanation and what transpired then and all that. I have

(MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER)

explained to him and the other Members. If he insists that an opportunity should be given now alone and that no other business should be conducted before that, it would not be correct.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎನ್. ಶಿವಪ್ಪ. — ಇದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಪವಿತ್ರ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇನ್ನೇನು ಕೆಲಸತಾನೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯ? ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಕ್ಟೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಲು ಬಂದು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಏನು ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪತಾನೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯ? ಇದನ್ನು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. “ನನ್ನ ಮೇಲೆ ಗೌರವರವಾದ ಆಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ನನಗೆ ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು” ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಪಾಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಈ ಸಂಬಂಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗಲೇ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರ ಇದಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಸುಲಭವಾದ ವಿಚಾರ. ಕಾಂಪ್ಲಿಕೇಟೆಡ್ ಆಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಸಭೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ, ನೋಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಮತ್ತೆ ನೋಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀನೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬೇಡ. ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಆಗಲೇ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಆ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ತುರ್ತಾಗಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have already stated whatever I wanted to say. I am not going to allow any more time for discussing this matter. I call upon the Hon'ble Finance Minister to begin his reply.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Finance).—Thank you very much Sir, for the time given.....

Sri K. LAKKAPPA.—On a point of order, Sir.

ನಿನ್ನೆಯದಿವಸ ನನಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನನಗೆ ಬಡ್ಡೆಟ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿಲ್ಲ, ದಯೆಯಿಟ್ಟು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is no time; he can speak on Demands.

Budget Estimates For 1964-65.

General discussion—(contd.)

Sri B. D. JATTI.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful for all the Hon'ble Members for having taken at least one hour in discussing something and getting nothing out of it.

(Interruption from several Members)

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—On a point of order, Sir. I request the Hon'ble Speaker to direct the Finance Minister to withdraw these words. ಒಂದು ಘಂಟೆಯ ಕಾಲ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು, ಅದರಿಂದ ಏನೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

What is that we wanted? It is not a profit making; it is not a 'choukasi vyapara' here. He cannot take this in that manner. ಅವರು ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕುಭಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಷ್ಟು ಲಘುವಾಗಿ ಏನೂ ಸಿಕ್ಕಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.